

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on December 2, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 14 and 19 are amended, claims 1-13 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 14-26 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 24-26 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has amended independent claim 19. Independent claim 19 now recite subject matter in which claims 24-26 further limit.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Piatt (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,287).

In the Office Action, the Examiner cited Col. 2, lines 49-51 of the Piatt reference as describing an adjustable feeding mechanism. The Piatt reference appears to describe a printer constructed to receive and feed a flexible composite sheet comprising a dielectric layer and bearing a continuous metal layer. (See Col. 2, lines 49-52).

In contrast, Applicant's independent claim 14 recites, besides other things:

an adjustable feeding mechanism for feeding at least a copper-clad substrate into the printer

The Piatt reference does not describe an adjustable feeding mechanism for feeding at least a copper-clad substrate into the printer as described by Applicant's independent claim 14.

Further, in the Office Action, the Examiner noted that "claim 14 includes functional language that does not define sufficient structure to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art." The Examiner further noted that "Applicant does not positively claim the inverse circuit image." The Applicant has amended independent claim 14 to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. For example, Applicant's independent claim 14, as amended, now

recites “an inverse circuit image printed by the printing mechanism on the copper-clad substrate.”

As such, each and every limitation of Applicant’s independent claim 14 is not shown in the Piatt reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of independent claim 14, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piatt (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,287) in view of Rouberol (U.S. Patent No. 6,379,569). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piatt (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,287) in view of Filo (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,836).

None of the above references cure the deficiencies of the Piatt reference. Accordingly, since the claims, rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) above, are dependent upon independent claim 14, the dependent claims are deemed allowable based upon the arguments provided herein with respect to independent claim 14.

Claims 17-19 and 22-26 were also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piatt (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,287) in view of Cooper, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,141). Since claims 17 and 18 depend from allowable claim 14, Applicant submits that claims 17 and 18 are deemed allowable.

With respect to claim 19, in the Office Action, the Examiner cited reference numeral 26 of the Cooper, et al. reference as teaching a flat-input feeder for feeding at least a copper-clad substrate into the printer. The Cooper, et al. reference appears to teach a media handling system (element 26 in the Cooper, et al. reference) for accommodating different sizes of print media, including letter, legal, A-4, envelopes, etc. (See Col. 3, lines 64-67 of the Cooper, et al. reference).

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claim 19, recites, besides other things:

a flat-input feeder for feeding at least a copper-clad substrate into the printer;

The Applicant was unable to locate in the Cooper, et al. reference, a teaching of a flat-input feeder for feeding at least a copper-clad substrate into the printer. As such, each and every limitation of Applicant's independent claim 19 is not taught or suggested, either in combination or standing alone, by the Piatt and Cooper, et al. references.

Further, in the Office Action, the Examiner noted that "claim 19 includes functional language that does not define sufficient structure to patentably distinguish the claim from the prior art." The Examiner further noted that "Applicant does not positively claim the inverse circuit image." The Applicant has amended independent claim 19 to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. For example, Applicant's independent claim 19, as amended, now recites "an inverse circuit image printed by the printing mechanism on the copper-clad substrate that is fed into the printer." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of independent claim 19, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piatt (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,287), in view of Cooper, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,141) and further in view of Rouberol (U.S. Patent No. 6,379,569). Claim 21 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Piatt (U.S. Patent No. 4,991,287), in view of Cooper, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,141) and further in view of Filo (U.S. Patent No. 5,334,836). Since claims 20 and 21 depend from allowable claim 19, Applicant submits that claims 20 and 21 are deemed allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (541) 715-1694 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: **MS AMENDMENT** Commissioner of Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 2nd day of March, 2005.


Name

Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Maxwell S. DeHaven

By his Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:


Jeffrey L. Cameron
Reg. No. 43,527

Date: